UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,077	03/31/2004	Thomas P. Nefos	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7344
7590 01/05/2007 Thomas P. Nefos 2300 West County Road 38E, #175 Fort Collins, CO 80526		7	EXAMINER LAURITZEN, AMANDA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		\mathcal{H}			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	10/815,077	NEFOS, THOMAS P.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Amanda L. Lauritzen	3737			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. Solve timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	,				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3.	<u>/31/2004</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ 1					
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims		, in the second			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the applicat	ion.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.	·			
2. Certified copies of the priority docum					
Copies of the certified copies of the p	oriority documents have been	received in this National Stage			
application from the International Bu					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.			
λ					
•					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 		formal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-1-2004</u> .	6) 🗌 Other:	<u>-</u> •			

Application/Control Number: 10/815,077

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because the limitation "the dual-core processor" at lines 9-10 on page 70 lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quistgaard et al. (U.S. 6,569,101) in view of Holupka et al. (U.S. 6,256,529).

Quistgaard et al. disclose a battery-powered handheld ultrasonic imaging system with LCD display comprising: a dual-core processor (para. 9), means for storing multiple images (video memory 254 provides storage of image frames as in para. 44), means for beam forming and processing, including storage of rf data and means for separating samples into in-phase and quadrature components with baseband demodulation (paras. 49-51). The beam formation is further disclosed to comprise fpga (para. 9). Quistgaard further discloses audio speakers and an operator interface including keypad and trackball and data storage with a standard pc memory card and USB port for flash memory capability (paras. 38 and 45).

Quistgaard et al. disclose all features as substantially claimed but does not include a head mounted display; however, in the same field of endeavor Holupka et al. disclose an ultrasound system with a head-mounted display that includes processing means for converting LCD signals

Application/Control Number: 10/815,077

Art Unit: 3737

into NTSC video signals (col. 9, lines 10-27). The headset of Holupka is capable of being used in adverse lighting conditions and includes ear speakers (see Fig. 11 and stereo sound at col. 9, line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the head-mounted display of Holupka et al. with the handheld ultrasound system of Quistgaard et al. in order to provide an alternative virtual reality visualization of a treatment area (for motivation see Holupka col. 1, lines 10-11; col. 3, lines 22-25).

Regarding cable or wireless connection capability, the invention of Quistgaard as modified by Holupka includes all features as substantially claimed, as detailed above but is silent with regard to mention of the computer connection, however, both wireless and cable computer connections are well known in the art.

Regarding the limitation that the memory is non-volatile, the memory formats disclosed by Quistgaard, namely PCMCIA and USB flash memory capability, are well known for non-volatility.

Regarding claim 7, the invention of Quistgaard as modified by Holupka includes all features as substantially claimed including audio capability of the headset, but does not explicitly disclose "ear speakers" as applicant has defined them as those that are actually placed within the ears. However, use of speakers of many varieties, including headphone-style sets that are placed within the ear are well known in the surgical/ultrasound arts and it therefore would be obvious to modify placement of the speakers within the ear in order to reduce ambient noise.

Regarding claim 12, for a low power, low voltage DDR SDRAM, the invention of Ouistgaard as modified by Holupka includes all features as substantially claimed, including Application/Control Number: 10/815,077

Art Unit: 3737

RAM memory storage capability but is silent regarding double data rate SDRAM, however; this form of RAM is well known in the medical ultrasound arts.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda L. Lauritzen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4303. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A.L.L. 12/18/2006

ELENI MANTIS MERCADER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER